

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shieh (Re. 36,968) in view of Kaczeus, Sr. et al. (6,154,360). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shieh in view of Kaczeus, Sr. et al., as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Lwee (5,324,204). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shieh in view of Kaczeus, Sr. et al., as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Tokunaga et al. (US/2002/0181147). Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

It is noted that the references to Lwee and Tokunaga et al. were initially cited by the Examiner in the outstanding Final Office Action. Thus, this amendment represents Applicant's initial opportunity to respond to the rejections based upon these references.

Drawings

It is noted that the Examiner has accepted Applicant's amended formal drawings of Figures 1 and 2 as filed July 7, 2003.

Claim Amendments

By this amendment, Applicant has canceled claim 10 and amended claim 8. It is believed that the amended claims specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant's amended independent claim 8 comprises a combination of original claims 8 and 10, thus re-drafting claim 10 in independent form. Claims 9 and 11 depend from Applicant's amended claim 8. In the absence of any art cited against Applicant's original claim 10, it is not believed that any

detailed discussion of the cited prior art references is necessary. Suffice to say that all of the claims remaining in this patent application contain subject matter against which no prior art citations have been made.

Summary

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner not be of the opinion that this case is in condition for allowance, it is requested that this amendment be entered for the purposes of appeal, since it materially reduces the issues on appeal by re-drafting claim 10 in independent form, thereby rendering moot the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).


It is not believed that the foregoing amendments to claim 8 require any further searching and/or consideration on the part of the Examiner, since such amendment merely includes incorporating the language of cancelled claim 10 into claim 8. Thus, the Examiner would have inherently searched the subject matter during the previous consideration of claim 10.

Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 29, 2003

By:



Bruce H. Troxell
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Louisbourg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707